REMARKS

Claims 1-7, 26-35 and 37-39 are currently pending in the subject application, and are presently under consideration. Claims 1-7, 26-35 and 37-39 are rejected. Favorable reconsideration of the application is requested in view of the amendments and comments herein.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-3, 5, 26-29, 32 and 33 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-3, 5, 26-29, 32 and 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,148,261 to Obradovich, et al. ("Obradovich") in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0066672 to Watchko, et al. ("Watchko"). Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested for at least the following reasons.

As argued in the Amendment filed October 27, 2008 (hereafter: "the previous Amendment"), it is submitted that even if the Obradovich system provides a teaching or suggestion of direct satellite communication, as argued in the Final Office Action, a combination of Obradovich and Watchko in the manner claimed would not be reasonably expected to achieve its intended purpose, and thus would not obvious to one of skill in the art. The Final Office Action does not directly address this argument, but states generally that the arguments relied on limitations not present in the claims. It is respectfully submitted, however, that each of claims 1 and 29 recite broadcasting data directly to a satellite relay. In producing a signal powerful enough for accurate reception at a satellite relay, as recited in the claim, an L-band transmitter produces a considerable amount of heat, much more than would be expected in a shorter range (*e.g.*, wireless phone) transmitter. One of skill in the art would not seek to redirect the heat from such a transmitter with the relatively thin metallic spray taught in Watchko, as it would be readily apparent to one of skill in the art that the thin conductive layer provided by the spray would be unlikely to provide sufficient redirection of the heat to protect the heat sensitive processing components within a tablet computer. It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner has not shown any reason why one of skill in the art would have any expectation of success, given the significant differences between the relatively low power cellular transmitters that are

the focus of Watchko and the L-band transmitter communicating with a satellite relay that is recited in claims 1 and 26. It is thus respectfully submitted that the proposed combination of Obradovich and Watchko is improper.

Further, claim 29 recites, in pertinent part, a Faraday cage that encloses the transceiver and the global positioning system module to reduce electromagnetic interference, the Faraday cage comprising the back plate of the tablet computer... and a metallic enclosure that encloses the transceiver and the global positioning system module..., the Faraday cage being configured as a heat sink to draw heat from the L-band transceiver away from the tablet computer. It is respectfully submitted that, even if one of skill in the art were led to attempt the combination proposed by the Examiner, the claimed Faraday cage would not result. Specifically, Watchko, even read broadly, teaches coating a plastic enclosure with a metallic coating. This does not comprise a metallic enclosure, and even if read as such, there is no teaching of utilizing the back plate of a tablet computer as one wall of the Faraday cage, where the tablet computer is operatively connected to the transceiver and the global positioning module through at least one aperture in a back plate, as recited in the claim. As argued in the previous Amendment, this modular configuration, clearly indicated in the recited claim language, provides advantages in the replacement of obsolete or damaged components that is not provided by the proposed combination of Obradovich and Watchko. It is thus respectfully submitted that claim 29 is patentable over the cited art.

Claims 2, 3, 5, 26-28, 32, and 33 each depend, directly or indirectly, from either claim 1 or 29, and are allowable for at least the reasons provided for their respective base claims. Accordingly, for the reasons described above, claims 1-3, 5, 26-29, 32 and 33 are patentable over the cited art, and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

II. Rejection of Claim 4 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Obradovich, in view of Watchko as applied to claim 1, and further in view of "*Xilinx*" by Bielby ("Bielby"). Claim 4 depends from claim 1, and is allowable for at least the same reasons. Bielby does not

remedy the deficiencies of Obradovich in view of Watchko as described above. Claim 4 is thus patentable over the cited art, and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

III. Rejection of Claims 6, 30, 34 and 36-39 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 6, 30, 34 and 36-39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Obradovich, in view of Watchko as applied to claim 1, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,542,117 to Broughton ("Broughton"), and in further view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0173909 to Verbil ("Verbil"). Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested for at least the following reasons.

The rejection of each of claims 6, 30, 34, and 36-39 depends on the proposed combination of Obradovich and Watchko, which, as described above, is improper, as one of skill in the art would not have a reasonable likelihood of success in utilizing the thin conductive coating of Watchko to redirect heat from an L-band transceiver producing a signal of sufficient strength to be received in a comprehensible fashion at a satellite relay as recited in the claims. Since the combination of Obradovich and Watchko was improper, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 6, 30, 34, and 37-39 based on this combination was improper. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

IV. Rejection of Claims 7, 31 and 35 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 7, 31 and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Obradovich, in view of Watchko, as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Broughton, and in further view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/00302426 to Gilbert, et al. ("Gilbert"), as applied to claim 6, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,285,341 to Roscoe, et al. ("Roscoe"). Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested for at least the following reasons.

The rejection of each of claims 7, 31, and 35 depends on the proposed combination of Obradovich and Watchko, which, as described above is improper, as one of skill in the art would not have a reasonable likelihood of success in utilizing the thin conductive coating of Watchko to redirect heat from an L-band transceiver producing a signal of sufficient strength to be received

in a comprehensible fashion at a satellite relay as recited in the claims. Since the combination of Obradovich and Watchko was improper, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 7, 31, and 35 based on this combination was improper. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application and that the application be passed to issue.

Please charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment in the fees for this amendment to our Deposit Account No. 20-0090.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 23 July 2009

/Christopher P. Harris/

Christopher P. Harris
Registration No. 43,660

CUSTOMER NO.: 26,294

TAROLLI, SUNDHEIM, COVELL, & TUMMINO L.L.P.
1300 EAST NINTH STREET, SUITE 1700
CLEVELAND, OHIO 44114
Phone: (216) 621-2234
Fax: (216) 621-4072